



MINUTES

Regular Meeting

Reno City Planning Commission

Thursday, November 21, 2024 • 6:00 PM

Reno City Council Chamber, One East First Street, Reno, NV 89501

Commissioners			
Harris Armstrong, Chair 326-8859			
Kerry Rohrmeier, Vice Chair	326-8864	J.D. Drakulich	326-8861
Manny Becerra	326-8860	Alex Velto	326-8858
Christina Del Villar	326-8862	Silvia Villanueva	326-8863

1 Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Becerra led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2 Roll Call

Commissioner Drakulich absent

3 Public Comment (This item is for either public comment on any action item or for any general public comment.)

Correspondence received was forwarded to the Planning Commission and entered into the record.

Public Comment:

Patrick Coleman (via Zoom)

4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - October 2, 2024 6:00 PM
(For Possible Action)

It was moved by Kerry Rohrmeier, seconded by Manny Becerra, to approve. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approve [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Kerry Rohrmeier, Vice Chair
SECONDER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner

AYES:	Armstrong, Becerra, Del Villar, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	J.D. Drakulich
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

4.2 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - October 16, 2024 6:00 PM
(For Possible Action)

It was moved by Manny Becerra, seconded by Kerry Rohrmeier, to approve. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approve [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Kerry Rohrmeier, Vice Chair
AYES:	Armstrong, Becerra, Del Villar, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	J.D. Drakulich
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

5 Public Hearings – Any person who has chosen to provide his or her public comment when a Public Hearing is heard will need to so indicate on the Request to Speak form provided to the Secretary. Alternatively, you may provide your comment when Item 3, Public Comment, is heard at the beginning of this meeting.

5.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC25-00003 (2400 West 7th Street)** - A request has been made for: 1) a tentative map for a 28-lot single-family detached subdivision; and 2) a major site plan review for cluster development. The ±3.72 acre project site is located directly south of the intersection at West 7th Street and Rhode Island Drive. The site is located in the Single-Family Residential – 8 units per acre (SF-8) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Single Family (SF).
[Ward 5]

Leah Piccotti, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Eric Hasty, Wood Rodgers, gave a presentation for the applicant.

Disclosures: read emails, spoke with residents, met with the applicant's representatives, visited and/or are familiar with the site, read the materials

Public Comment:

Liz Knott

Barbara Korosa

Tejay Harvey

Ashleigh Harvey

Tim Smith
Aryanna Smith

Questions:

Commissioner Rohrmeier asked if a major deviation or variance would have been an option for this, given the constraints like the ditch and retention.

Ms. Piccotti explained that you cannot ask for a major deviation or variance from lot standards or density. Other options besides a cluster development would be a specific plan district where they write their own zoning code for the site.

Commissioner Becerra asked if there is a comparable project they can reference that is similar to this project.

Ms. Piccotti stated a good example of another cluster development is at the intersection of Moana and Plumas. There are other cluster developments but nothing comparable to this. We generally see cluster developments with much larger parcels with cluster developments throughout the parcel.

Commissioner Becerra asked what specific benefits to the broader community this project offers.

Mr. Hasty stated the unique site feature they are protecting is the fact that even though this is an infill site, we do have the properties to the west draining in on this. The fact that West 7th Street does not have storm drain facilities, and that we can not drain into the Highland Ditch, these are the unique site features that we are accounting for and protecting with storm water and storm water quality.

Commissioner Villanueva asked if the design of the cul-de-sac creates any problems for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Hasty stated that Reno Fire did review this and because of the length of the cul-de-sac there is no need for secondary access. It is designed to be able to accommodate for on street parking for a fire truck to be able to get in and turn around.

Commissioner Villanueva asked if the rear of the houses and adjacent properties are separated by a fence.

Mr. Hasty stated the rear of the properties will be fenced and have grading separations.

Commissioner Velto stated he wants a better understanding of the clustering development analysis and asked how clustering better attains preservation of trees.

Mr. Hasty stated the reasons they are not calling out the trees along the western boundary as being preserved is because they need to verify that they are viable and that NV Energy will allow them to maintain. There is a condition to have a certified arborist identify trees that are viable for preservation.

Commissioner Velto asked for information on how cluster development affects drainage.

Eric Hasty explained that the onsite retention that is needed will take up a lot of the develop-able area and cluster development will allow for density on this infill site.

Commissioner Velto stated he does not think this project will contribute to the existing high speed traffic issue on 7th Street and asked if there is anything the applicant can do to allow for a stop sign or speed radar that would help solve that problem.

Mr. Hasty stated he is not sure if a stop sign is appropriate, or what RTC would deem appropriate. The applicant may be open to some type of signage. They would be agreeable to a condition as long as it is within the standards of what RTC would recommend and the City of Reno.

Commissioner Del Villar asked staff why they are deciding on two significant things together, those being the map itself and the clustering.

Ms. Piccotti explained that it is typical to see these types of projects lumped together, especially when you have a tentative map.

Commissioner Del Villar asked how many homes could be put here without the clustering.

Ms. Piccotti stated approximately 27 homes would be allowed.

Chair Armstrong asked staff to explain their thought process for recommending approval on this, taking into account being kind of torn on master plan priorities.

Ms. Piccotti stated she was on the fence and could have gone either way on this one. In the long run, she thought that with some conditions of approval it could be found compatible. One of the problems with cluster development is

that there is no quantifiable standard. Weighing the competing master plan policies, she can find that overall it meets Reno Municipal Code. With discretionary reviews, staff looks to the Planning Commission to determine if it meets the intent of code and the master plan.

Chair Armstrong asked what the reason is for requesting a cluster development versus an alternative use if you are effectively getting the same amount of lots.

Ms. Piccotti stated that doing a specific plan district for something like this may not have been viewed as favorably because that is more of a whole zone change than just a deviation. She explained her past experience with cluster development noting that they often deal with larger parcels and allow for preservation of open space.

Commissioner Becerra asked how this project aligns with the housing goals and policies in the Master Plan, particularly regarding compatibility, quality of life, and neighborhood preservation.

Ms. Piccotti stated there is a slide in her presentation that shows it meets some of the policies and is in direct conflict with others.

Commissioner Becerra asked the applicant if there was any communication with residents regarding promises made to gain their trust.

Mr. Hasty stated they had a neighborhood public meeting and everything they presented at that meeting is in the staff report. He was surprised to hear allegations that he was being misleading and believes they presented the facts. Their goal is to meet the requirements of the Master Plan by providing density in the McCarran ring as well as provide single-family detached homes in an area that is primarily single-family detached homes.

Commissioner Villanueva asked staff if the applicant could build multi-family in this space.

Ms. Piccotti stated they could do an attached product or duplexes or triplexes with a discretionary review process.

Discussion:

Commissioner Rohrmeier thanked the City for deliberating so well on this because it is a challenging case. I don't see how this applies as a cluster development. I believe in in-fill and density and those things are at odds here. There are designs that could have been considered that would have achieved those mitigation lot match on the west side that were not considered, and

higher density perhaps on the east side. For that alone, I don't see how this is a cluster development. I could support a variance, if that was an opportunity because there are a number of hardships related to the retention of water that is flowing on the site.

Commissioner Becerra echoed Commissioner Rohrmeier's comments and agreed that he can not make the finding of seeing this as a cluster development. While it meets the minimum of the code, I don't think that is the bar we want to set. I don't think it meets the broader intent. I applaud the applicant for working with staff to try and get there, I am just not there myself yet.

Commissioner Velto stated he has struggled with this cluster development finding. I did appreciate the explanation from the applicant regarding why a more traditional site development plan would not necessarily preserve trees and also may not protect other environmental concerns. The way they explained how the project and the way it was developed may benefit from storm drains and runoff, I think is a reason why we can make the cluster development findings. Beyond that, I do think the project is compatible, especially when you are taking into account alternatives that could be there. I can make the general findings for the rest of them. While I understand there might be a disagreement with the method in which the product has gotten here, I don't think it is our job to say there was another avenue they could have gone. I'm hearing from staff that a lot of the findings can be made. As far as the policy portion, I think that is our job to try and make those policy findings and for a lot of those I feel comfortable making them because this allows for more housing which is something we strive for as a city. I do appreciate that the applicant is willing to do things beyond what is required. It sounded like they would be agreeable to allowing for a speed radar or indicator sign at this location which would be beneficial to the community. Given what is on the table as an alternative that they could do more densification in the future and that those options are available aside from single-family, I think that would be less characteristic of the neighborhood and that is why I would be in support of the project.

Chair Armstrong stated he has a hard time making the cluster development findings. There are issues with respect to intent of the law that make this murky. I typically like to get comfortable with more of a black and white either it fits or doesn't, and this is just too gray so I won't be able to support it.

Commissioner Becerra stated his motion for denial is due to lack of adhering to the master plan and the definition of cluster development as presented.

Commissioner Rohrmeier supported the motion to deny on the basis of cluster development finding number one.

Commissioner Villanueva supported the motion to deny because she cannot make the finding for cluster development.

Chair Armstrong supported the motion to deny specifically only with respect to the finding related to cluster development.

Chair Armstrong read the appeal process into the record.

It was moved by Manny Becerra, seconded by Silvia Villanueva, to deny. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Deny [5 TO 1]
MOVER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
AYES:	Armstrong, Becerra, Del Villar, Rohrmeier, Villanueva
NAYS:	Alex Velto
ABSENT:	J.D. Drakulich
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

- 5.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council):
Case No. **LDC25-00011 (ArrowLeaf Zoning Map Amendment)** - A request has been made for a zoning map amendment from Multi-Family Residential 30 units per acre (MF-30) to General Commercial (GC). The ±1.96 acre site is comprised of five parcels located on the west side of Harvard Way ±550 feet north of its intersection with Vassar Street. The site has a Master Plan designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 3]**

Jeff Foster, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Mike Daniels, the applicant's representative, gave a brief statement.

Disclosures: familiar with the site

Public Comment:

None

It was moved by Silvia Villanueva, seconded by Christina Del Villar, to recommend that City Council approve the zoning map amendment by ordinance. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approve [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Christina Del Villar, Commissioner
AYES:	Armstrong, Becerra, Del Villar, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	

ABSENT:	J.D. Drakulich
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

- 5.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC25-00012 (ArrowLeaf Apartments Conditional Use Permit)** - A request has been made for a conditional use permit to allow a 168 unit affordable multi-family development. The ±5.17 acre site is comprised of 11 parcels located on both sides of Harvard Way ±550 feet north of its intersection with Vassar Street. The site is zoned General Commercial (GC) and Multi-Family Residential 30 units per acre (MF-30) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 3]**

(The meeting was called back to order after a five-minutes recess.)

Jeff Foster, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation and referenced the additional Condition No. 10 recently provided in a memo to the Planning Commission.

Mike Daniels, the applicant's representative, was available to answer questions. He also explained that the length of time the units can be dedicated to affordable housing depends on the type of funding they are able to get and he requested that Condition No. 6 be amended to reflect that.

Disclosures: familiar with the site

Public Comment:

None

Correspondence received was forwarded to the Planning Commission and entered into the record.

Questions:

Commissioner Del Villar asked for more information regarding Condition No. 6 and the requested change.

Mr. Foster explained that condition was included because the application was submitted as an affordable housing project. The applicant communicated to staff that this would be an affordable product for between 30 to 50 years. Mr. Foster also pointed out that the applicant did not request any of the allowances that would be afforded to them under code for being an affordable project so there is not a strict tie to being an affordable project. Staff is open to amending the condition as requested by the applicant.

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, stated this project does meet the standards for a standard multi-family project.

Commissioner Velto asked if Condition No. 6 were not included, would staff be able to make the remaining findings.

Mr. Foster confirmed that staff can make all of the findings without that condition.

Mr. Railey stated that condition could go away entirely since the applicant is not requesting any of the benefits or incentives that come with an affordable housing project.

Commissioner Velto stated he does not want to remove the condition and asked if legal counsel is okay with the condition being in place.

Jasmine Mehta, Deputy City Attorney, stated that since the applicant is not requesting any of the characteristics that might be granted for an affordable housing project, this could be approved without an affordable housing condition. State and federal funding would require at least certain units to be affordable. She stated it would be better to remove the condition altogether.

Commissioner Becerra asked the applicant if they are asking for the removal of the condition or just a change in language.

Mr. Daniels stated they would be fine with the condition if the timing is tied to the funding. He also stated their goal is for this project to be affordable. They are in the application process for funding but if they don't get any funding, the project would not be an affordable housing project.

Commissioner Becerra asked if the applicant would be amenable to keeping a modified version of the condition so they are afforded flexibility if they don't get the funding.

Mr. Daniels stated if it is based on funding, that would be fine.

Mr. Railey stated that if the applicant acquires the funding, they will have to record documentation that the project is affordable so it may be an issue that takes care of itself when their funding comes through.

Discussion:

Commissioner Villanueva stated it will be affordable if they get the funding and it is not tied to any of the affordable housing incentives. She doesn't see any

value in keeping the condition.

Chair Armstrong agreed.

It was moved by Alex Velto, seconded by Kerry Rohrmeier, to approve the conditional use permit, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report, with the addition of Condition No. 10 as presented by staff and the removal of Condition No. 6. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approve [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Alex Velto, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Kerry Rohrmeier, Vice Chair
AYES:	Armstrong, Becerra, Del Villar, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	J.D. Drakulich
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

- 5.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council):
Case No. **LDC25-00010 (Security Circle Yard Zoning Map Amendment)** - A request has been made for a zoning map amendment from the Mixed-Use Suburban (MS) zoning district to the Mixed Employment (ME) zoning district. The ±2.2-acre site occupies two parcels located on the northeast corner of the intersection at North Virginia Street and Security Circle (7705 & 7725 Security Circle). The subject site has a Master Plan land use designation of Mixed-Employment (ME). **[Ward 4]**

Daniel Martoma, Associate Planner Specialist, gave the staff presentation.

Disclosures: familiar with the site

Public Comment:

None

Questions:

Mr. Martoma confirmed for Commissioner Becerra that this is just to bring this area into conformance with the master plan.

It was moved by Kerry Rohrmeier, seconded by Christina Del Villar, to recommend that City Council approve the zoning map amendment by ordinance. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approve [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Kerry Rohrmeier, Vice Chair
SECONDER:	Christina Del Villar, Commissioner
AYES:	Armstrong, Becerra, Del Villar, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	

ABSENT:	J.D. Drakulich
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

- 5.5 Staff Report (For Possible Action – Recommendation to City Council):
Case No. **TXT23-00005 (Title 18 Zoning Code Clean-Up)** – A request has been made to adopt an updated Title 18 (Annexation and Land Development Code of the City of Reno) of the Reno Municipal Code to address grammatical errors, inconsistencies with regulations, unintended deletions or insertions, and changes from the 2023 legislative session; together with matters which pertain to or are necessarily connected therewith. **[Ward City-wide]**

Public Comment:
John McGinnes
Tyler Colton (via Zoom)

Angela Fuss, Assistant Director of Development Services, gave the staff presentation on the zoning code clean-up. The presentation included information on the changes being made, the public outreach process that was used, and topics that are not included in the clean-up.

Questions:

Commissioner Velto asked if the concern raised during public comment regarding cabaret licenses is something that can be addressed by Council.

Ms. Fuss explained the background of how live entertainment came to be addressed in 2021 through a zoning code update. Live entertainment is now allowed in every zoning district but there are rules, including the requirement of a conditional use permit for any business that wants live entertainment after 11:00 p.m. This may be something that a lot of businesses are not understanding. It is not limiting 24-hour businesses, but if you want live entertainment after 11:00 p.m., a conditional use permit is required. We are not coming after businesses that have been operating with a cabaret license. As long as we have some kind of documentation that says they were approved through the city for live entertainment they are grandfathered in. Any new business that comes in, has to follow today's rules for live entertainment.

Commissioner Villanueva asked if it is possible some of the confusion expressed during public comment is related to prior entitlements for live entertainment.

Ms. Fuss confirmed that is possible and stated that staff now has a spreadsheet

with every entitlement related to live entertainment so they can better track it with the Code Enforcement team. Also, prior entitlements are tied to business owners and a conditional use permit is tied to the land. There are no changes to live entertainment being proposed here, that was done through a separate text amendment. We need to better educate the business community on what they are entitled to and what rights they have.

It was moved by Kerry Rohrmeier, seconded by Manny Becerra, to recommend that City Council approve the text amendment by ordinance, with the edit to section 18.03.405(h)(2) as discussed. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approve [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Kerry Rohrmeier, Vice Chair
SECONDER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
AYES:	Armstrong, Becerra, Del Villar, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	J.D. Drakulich
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

6 Training on the Importance of Land Use Findings

Angela Fuss, Assistant Director of Development Services, gave the training presentation.

7 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

Chair Armstrong reported on the required public meetings that are part of the Regional Plan update process.

8 Staff Announcements

8.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.

The Bella Vista Ranch PUD Amendment and Calvary Chapel Zone Change were approved at the last City Council meeting.

8.2 Announcement of upcoming training opportunities.

8.3 Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings.

8.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.

9 Commissioner's Suggestions for Future Agenda Items (For Possible Action)

None

10 Public Comment (This item is for either public comment on any action item or for

any general public comment.)

Tyler Colton (via Zoom)

11 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:11 p.m.